

-6-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 15, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of these remarks and amendments.

Claim 1-20 are currently pending in this Application.

Claims 15-18 have been withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 19 are canceled.

Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 11 are herein amended.

In the previous response, Applicants replied to the rejection of Claim 1 by suggesting that the interceptors in Kukura '923 are for receiving object invocations and passing control, while in contrast the claimed interceptors in the present application receive events (data) for selectively computing a decision to allow or block activity. The Office Action responds that such language is not recited in the claims. Applicants were characterizing the language in claim 1 which reads "plural interceptors identifying and governing the activity." Applicants submits that governing the activity and deciding whether to allow or block the activity describe the same operation, and deciding whether to "allow or block" the activity clarifies the recited "governing" of the activity. Nonetheless, Applicants have herein amended claim 1 to recite "selectively computing a decision to allow or block the activity," as suggested in the Office Action.

Further, the subject matter of claim 19 has been amended into claim 1, including intervening claim 2, to further refine applicants' claimed invention. The Office Action suggests that the claimed interceptors are disclosed in Kukura. Kukura '923, however, employs interceptors responsive to threading (control) rules, (column 15, line 16) not the claimed interceptors operable to receive a sequence of events indicative of requests for operating system resources. The claimed interceptors, therefore, receive events for computing a state. In contrast, the cited Kukura interceptors receive ORB invocations for accessing a predetermined service (col. 42:50-65). The interceptors in Kukura '923, therefore, are for receiving object invocations and passing control, while the

-7-

claimed interceptors in the present case receive events (data) for selectively computing a decision to allow or block activity, therefore governing the activity.

Further, the Kukura interceptors make no disclosure of state information, employed by the rule interpreter which applies the rule to the activity identified and the state information, also recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is deemed allowable in view of the foregoing remarks and it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) be withdrawn in view of these remarks and amendments. Further Claim 11, rejected on similar grounds, has been likewise amended accordingly.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 11, which by the foregoing are deemed allowable, it is respectfully submitted that all claims now in the case are in condition for allowance.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-8-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-19

Dated: April 13, 2006